

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,189	11/03/2003	David James Bennetts	Bennetts 2-5	3986
Theodore Nacc	7590 02/09/2007 carella	EXAMINER		
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP 2600 ARAMARK Tower 1101 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950			EKONG, EMEM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	LY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/09/2007	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/700,189	BENNETTS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	EMEM EKONG	2617			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 November 2003</u>.</li> <li>2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.</li> <li>3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</li> </ul>					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 November 2003</u> is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objector drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Po 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2617

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument that the various user interfaces of Harris are always exposed are not persuasive for the reason that Harris discloses the latch 112 physically couples the housings 108 and 110, the latch 112 permits rotation of, and detachment of, the housings 108 and 110, the latch 112 is electrically coupled to the controller 118 via bus 191, the latch 112 provides signals on the bus 191 indicating the position of the housing 110 relative to the housing 108 when the housings 108 and 110 are attached (col. 6 lines 3-11), if the housings 108 ad 110 are rotating relative to each other, such that it is attached, from the examiner's understanding, the first surface of the first housing 108 could be unexposed at a closed position or exposed at another closed position since Harris further teaches housings attached at a first and second alignment, therefore, Harris discloses applicant's limitation of the first user interface being inaccessible and user interface being accessible. However, Harris fails to specifically disclose it as the applicant's that the first surface of the first member is closed toward one surface of the other member such that the first user interface is inaccessible. Otsuka discloses the first surface of the first member is closed toward one surface of . the other member such that the first user interface is inaccessible (see figures 7 and 10). Harris further teaches communication device including two housings and the communication device switches between the different modes based on the attachment

or detachment and the relative position of the housings (abstract, and col. 2 lines 40-48), therefore, Harris discloses applicant's limitation of "mode dependence based on position of housings relative to each other." the combination of Harris and Otsuka teaches applicant's limitations and serves as the reason for combining.

Therefore the argued limitations are the same as disclosed by the reference, rejections are maintained as repeated below.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Art Unit: 2617

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris in view of Japanese Patent No. 2002314657 to Otsuka.

Regarding claim 1, Harris discloses a portable electronic communication apparatus including a first user-interface having at least three modes of operation (col. 2 lines 40-42), the apparatus including: first and second housing members each having a first surface and an opposite second surface (col. 3 lines 9-20), the first user interface being provided at the first surface of the first housing member; and a connecting mechanism for movably connecting the first and second housing members, wherein the position of the first and second members relative to each other determines a mode of operation of the apparatus such that (col. 2 lines 40-48, and col. 3 lines 9-25), when the first and second housing members are connected and positioned together in a first closed position such that the second surface of the first member is closed toward one surface of the other member such that the user interface is accessible, the apparatus is in a first mode of operation of the user interface (col. 2 lines 48-50), and when the first and second housing members are connected and positioned together in a second closed position such that the first surface of the first member is closed toward one surface of the other member, the apparatus is in a second mode of operation of the user-interface (col. 2 lines 45-48, and col. 12 lines 40-45).

Art Unit: 2617

However, Harris fails to disclose the first surface of the first member is closed toward one surface of the other member such that the first user interface is inaccessible. Otsuka discloses the first surface of the first member is closed toward one surface of the other member such that the first user interface is inaccessible (see figures 7 and 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Harris, and have the first surface of the first member is closed toward one surface of the other member such that the first user interface is inaccessible as disclosed by Otsuka for the purpose of having the mobile device in a different closed orientations such that the interface is inaccessible for different usage.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Harris and Otsuka discloses a portable electronic communication apparatus according to claim 1 wherein, when the first and second housing members are connected and positioned apart from each other in am open position, the apparatus is in a third mode of operation of the user-interface in which the user-interface is active (col. 2 lines 48-51, when housing are detached, the device operates in another mode).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Harris and Otsuka discloses a portable electronic communication apparatus according to claim 2 wherein the first user-interface is a display (see figure 1, and col. 3 line 18).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Harris and Otsuka discloses a portable

Art Unit: 2617

electronic communication device according to claim 4 wherein the apparatus comprises one and only one display (see figure 1, col. 1 lines 53-63, and col. 5 lines 45-59).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, the combination of Harris and Otsuka discloses a portable electronic communication apparatus according to claim 1 further comprising a second user interface at the first surface of the second member (co. 3 line 12, and col. 6 lines 13-24).

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Harris and Otsuka discloses a portable electronic communication apparatus according to claim 1 wherein the first mode or operation is a fully operational mode of operation in which the first user interface is active (col. 9 lines 6-22).

Regarding claims 13 and 14, the combination of Harris and Otsuka discloses a portable electronic communication device according to claim 1, wherein the apparatus is a mobile telephone (col. 1 lines 46-47, and col. 57-65).

6. Claim 3, and 10-12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris in view of Otsuka, and further in view of US Patent No. 6549789 B1 to Kfoury.

Regarding claims 3, and 10-12, the combination of Harris and Otsuka discloses wherein the second mode of operation is a standby mode of operation (col. 8 lines 1-35, and col. 11lines 8-57, it is inherent that in the note taking mode the phone is switched off. however, the combination fails to disclose wherein in the second mode of operation,

Art Unit: 2617

the user-interface being inactive. In a similar endeavor, Kfoury discloses the user-interface is inactive (col. 5 lines 42-44, and col. 5 lines 51-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination, and have the user-interface inactive as disclosed by Kfoury for the purpose of using different modes with the apparatus.

7. Claim 17 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otsuka in view of Harris.

Regarding claim 17, Otsuka discloses a portable communication device comprising a first housing and a second housing (pars. 1-2), each housing comprising a first surface and a second, opposing surface, said first housing including a first user interface disposed in the first surface thereof, said device further comprising a pivot mechanism that permits the first and second housings to be pivoted between a first open position in which the first and second housings are connected to each other and are arranged generally end-to-end with each other (see figures 8 and 9, and pars. 2 and 3) and a first closed position in which the first and housings are connected and the second surfaces of the first and second housings, respectively, face each other such that, in the first closed position, the first user interface is accessible, a second closed position in which the first and second housings are connected ad the first surfaces of the first and second housings are connected ad the first surfaces of the first and second housings, respectively, face each other such that, in the second closed position, the first user interface is inaccessible (see figure 6, pars. 8-13 and 26-27).

However, Otsuka fails to disclose the device is in a first operational mode when in the first open position, in a second operational mode when in the first closed position and in a third operational mode when in the second closed position, means for automatically detecting when the device is in the first open position, the first closed position, or the second closed position, and means for automatically entering the corresponding mode responsive to the means for detecting.

Harris discloses the device is in a first operational mode when in the first open position, in a second operational mode when in the first closed position and in a third operational mode when in the second closed position, means for automatically detecting when the device is in the first open position, the first closed position, or the second closed position, and means for automatically entering the corresponding mode responsive to the means for detecting (col. 6 lines 3-24, col. 6 lines 50-67, col. 7 line 23-col. 8 line 35, col. 9 lines 5-35, it is inherent that detecting and sensing is done of opening and closing positions of housing by i.e. latch, switch, contact, sensor in order for corresponding mode changes to occur).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Otsuka, and have the device is in a first operational mode when in the first open position, in a second operational mode when in the first closed position and in a third operational mode when in the second closed position, means for automatically detecting when the device is in the first open position, the first closed position, or the second closed position, and means for automatically

entering the corresponding mode responsive to the means for detecting for the purpose of detecting opening and closing of housing for mode change of apparatus.

Regarding claims 27-29, the combination of Otsuka an Harris discloses a portable communication device according to claim 17, further comprising means for enabling a user of the device to select at least the second and third operational modes, wherein the first user interface is a display and is active in the first and second operational modes and inactive in the third operational mode, further comprising a second user interface disposed in the first surface of the second housing such that, in the first closed position, the second user interface is accessible, and, in the second closed position, the second user interface is inaccessible (Harris, col. 12 lines 38-50, the user of apparatus selectively changes the mode of the apparatus by attaching and detaching in different orientations), (Otsuka, see figure 7).

Claims 28, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable 8. over Otsuka in view of Harris, and further in view of Kfoury.

Regarding claims 28, and 33-35, the combination of Otsuka and Harris discloses a portable communication device according to claims 17, and 29, wherein the first user interface is a display and is active in the first and second operational modes and inactive in the third operational mode.

However, the combination fails to disclose wherein the second user interface is a keypad and is active in the first operational mode and inactive in the second operational

mode, wherein the first and second user interfaces are inactive in the third operational mode.

Kfoury discloses an apparatus with multiple modes of operation, selectively adapted to operate in an inactive mode, active mode or a combination (col.3 lines 14-16, col. 5 lines 42-45 and claim 17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination, and have the second user interface is a keypad and is active in the first operational mode and inactive in the second operational mode, wherein the first and second user interfaces are inactive in the third operational mode as disclosed by Kfoury for the purpose of operating an apparatus in different modes.

#### Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2617

Page 11

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EMEM EKONG whose telephone number is 571 272 8129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 Mon-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571 272 7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EOE 2/1/07

> LESTER G. KINCAID SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER